

REMARKS

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated December 7, 2010 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed. Applicant also thanks the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview held March 1, 2011. The results of which have been incorporated herein.

Claims 31-40 are amended. Claims 1-30 were previously canceled. Claims 41 and 42 are new. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 31-42 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 32 and 36 are objected to because of grammatical informalities. Claims 32 and 36 have been amended to more fully clarify the grammar. Applicant believes the amendments obviate the objections to claims 32 and 36 and requests withdrawal of the objection.

Claims 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Claims 31-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui, U.S. Patent 5,677,741 in view of Kimura et al., U.S. Patent 6,008,786. Claims 36-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yui, U.S. Patent 5,677,741 in view of Kimura et al., U.S. Patent 6,008,786 and further in view of McKinnon et al, U.S. Patent 6,227,668. Applicant notes U.S. Patent No. 7,046,255 to D'Souza has been cited in the body of the rejections and considers this reference to be used in combination in the rejection of claims 36-37.

Applicant has amended claims 31-40 to replace "bit" with "gray scale level" as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant believes this overcomes the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection and requests withdrawal of this rejection to claims 31-40.

The Applicant respectfully submits that Yui, Kimura, McKinnon, and D'Souza fails to teach or suggest all the limitations set forth in claims 31 and 36; therefore, this combination of references cannot render any of the claims obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

As discussed during the interview, Applicant has amended independent claim 31. Claim 31, as amended, recites in part, "a lookup table for storing gray scale values of image information including R, G and B data, and storing a gray scale value of a gray level of the B

data prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced, as a gray scale value of gray levels from the gray level at which the color reproducibility is reduced to an uppermost gray level, wherein the lookup table includes a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced and the lookup table includes different gray scale values of the R and G data to mix with the B gray scale values from a gray level at which the color reproducibility is reduced to an uppermost gray level.”

In contrast, none of the cited references teaches or suggests “the lookup table includes a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced.” Yui allegedly discloses a custom table memory for storing gray scale values for R, G, and B data to maximize color space reproduction with different color space limitations between a host image source and a user viewable display. To accomplish this goal, Yui may “clip” the upper gray levels of the R, G, and B data. However, Yui fails to teach “the lookup table includes a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced.” In fact, Yui teaches various data for gray levels as disclosed in Yui Fig. 6.

Kimura is cited because it allegedly teaches a structure for a liquid crystal display panel with 64 gray levels. Whether or not this is true, Kimura at least fails to disclose a “lookup table includes a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced.” Therefore, Kimura does not cure the deficiencies of Yui in this regard. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 31-35. New claim 41 is also dependent from claim 31 and is allowable for at least the same reason.

As also discussed during the interview, Applicant has amended claim 36. Claim 36, as amended, recites in part “storing a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced and including different gray scale values of the R and G data to mix with the B gray scale values from a gray level at which the color reproducibility is reduced to an uppermost gray level.”

With regard to independent claim 36, Applicant traverses the rejection for the same reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 31. Claims 37-40 are dependent from claims 36. Accordingly, the combined teachings of Yui, Kimura, McKinnon, and D'Souza also fails to disclose each and every feature of claims

D'Souza is cited to disclose a LCD driving method with compensating image formation. However, D'Souza fails to disclose any particular gray level associated with a gray scale value. On the other hand, D'Souza appears to disclose operational matrices including the same gray scale values for all R, G, and B data. In other words, D'Souza does not disclose "storing a same initial gray scale value of at least one of the R and G data for all gray levels prior to a gray level at which a color reproducibility is reduced and including different gray scale values of the R and G data to mix with the B gray scale values from a gray level at which the color reproducibility is reduced to an uppermost gray level."

McKinnon is cited to disclose measuring color reproducibility of a display and also does not cure the deficiencies discussed above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 36-40 are allowable over Yui, Kimura, D'Souza, and McKinnon. New claim 42 is also dependent from claim 36 and is allowable for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 36-40.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe the foregoing amendments place the application in condition for allowance and early, favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: April 6, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

By /Valerie P. Hayes/
Valerie P. Hayes
Registration No.: 53,005
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 496-7500
Attorneys for Applicant